



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,751	12/21/2001	Joel P. Dunsmore	10004016-1	3808

7590 10/27/2005

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Legal Department, DL429
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 7599
Loveland, CO 80537-0599

EXAMINER

BHAT, ADITYA S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2863	

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/027,751	DUNSMORE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aditya S. Bhat	2863	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 16-26 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 27-29 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 4-15 and 30-32 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Marks (USPN 5,758,273).

Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Marks (USPN 5,758,273)

With regards to claim 1, Marks (USPN 5,758,273) teaches a method of extending dynamic range of a test, system that has a receiver channel comprising:

compensating for an effect that compression (Col.1, lines 44-47) of the receiver channel has on as magnitude response and a phase response of the receiver channel. (Col. 2, lines 21-25) (see abstract)

With regards to claim 27, Marks (USPN 5,758,273)teaches test system having extended dynamic range comprising:

a receiver channel; (Col. 2, lines 21-25)

a controller that processes magnitude data and phase data generated by the receiver channel; (Col.4 lines 53-57) and

Art Unit: 2863

a computer program stored in memory, the computer program being executed by the controller, the computer program implementing instructions that compensate for an effect on the generated data caused by the receiver channel being compressed.

Although, the Marks (USPN 5,758,273) does not appear to explicitly state a computer program implementing instructions that compensate for an effect on the generated data caused by the receiver channel being compressed.

Marks (USPN 5,758,273) teaches a processor to compensate for an effect on the generated data caused by the receiver channel being compressed. (Col. 4, lines 53-54). It would be inherent to this hardware system to use some sort of software program or instructions in order to carry out the task of compensating for an effect on the generated data caused by the receiver channel being compressed

With regards to claim 28, Marks (USPN 5,758,273) teaches a power limiter connected to an input of the receiver channel, wherein the instructions implemented by the computer program further compensate for an effect on the generated data caused by the limiter being compressed. (16; Col. 4, lines 52-54)

Claims 1 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Apostolos (USPN 5,079,735)

With regards to claim 1, Apostolos (USPN 5,079,735) teaches a method of extending dynamic range of a test, system that has a receiver channel comprising: compensating for an effect that compression of the receiver channel has on as magnitude response and a phase response of the receiver channel. (Col. 6, lines 8-15)

With regards to claim 27, Apostolos (USPN 5,079,735) teaches test system having extended dynamic range comprising:

a receiver channel; (10;Col. 3,lines 4-5)

a controller that processes magnitude data and phase data generated by the receiver channel; (figure 1) and

a computer program stored in memory, the computer program being executed by the controller, the computer program implementing instructions that compensate for an effect on the generated data caused by the receiver channel being compressed.

Although, the Apostolos (USPN 5,079,735) does not appear to explicitly state a computer program implementing instructions that compensate for an effect on the generated data caused by the receiver channel being compressed. It does teach a memory and some processing, also it does teach compensating for an effect on the generated data caused by the receiver channel being compressed. (Col. 6, lines10-15)

It would be inherent to this hardware system to use some sort of computer software in order to compensate for an effect on the generated data caused by the receiver channel being compressed. (Col. 5, lines 45-60)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-3 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marks (USPN 5,758,273) in view of Bell et al . (USPN 5,491,548).

With regards to claim 2, Marks (USPN 5,758,273) does not appear to teach correcting data measured for one of a device under test and a signal under test using the test system wherein the test system is one of network analyzer or a spectrum analyzer.

Bell et al . (USPN 5,491,548) teaches correcting data measured for one of a device under test and a signal under test using the test system wherein the test system is one of network analyzer or a spectrum analyzer.(Col. 8, lines 23-25)

It would've been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Marks invention to include the spectrum analyzer taught by Bell et al . (USPN 5,491,548) to arrive at the claimed invention in order to accurately reproduce optical signals. (Col. 3, line 52)

Allowable Subject Matter

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claims 4-15, and 30-32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claims 4, 16:

The primary reason for the allowance of claim 4 is the inclusion of the method steps of: characterizing a first receiver channel of the test system for a first magnitude compression response and a first phase compression response; characterizing a

second receiver channel of the test system for a second magnitude compression response and a second phase compression response; and compensating magnitude and phase data for the compression responses of each of the channels, the magnitude and phase data being measured by the first channel and the second channel.

It is this feature found in the claim, as it is claimed in the combination that has not been found, taught or suggested by the prior art of record, which makes this claim allowable over the prior art.

The primary reason for the allowance of claim 16 is the inclusion of the method steps of: characterizing a second receiver channel of the test system for a second magnitude compression response and a second phase compression response. It is this feature found in the claim, as it is claimed in the combination that has not been found, taught or suggested by the prior art of record, which makes this claim allowable over the prior art.

The primary reason for the allowance of claim 30 is the inclusion of the method steps of: another receiver channel; and a signal source; wherein the signal source generates a signal that is applied to the receiver channel, to an input of a device under test, and after passing through the device under test, to the other receiver channel, and wherein phase is measured as a phase difference between the receiver channels. It is this feature found in the claim, as it is claimed in the combination that has not been found, taught or suggested by the prior art of record, which makes this claim allowable over the prior art.

Art Unit: 2863

Claims 5-16 are allowed due to their dependency on claim 4.

Claims 17-26 are allowed due to their dependency on claim 16.

Claims 31-32 are allowed due to their dependency on claim 30.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant is reminded that during patent examination, the pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

While the meaning of claims of issued patents are interpreted in light of the specification, prosecution history, prior art and other claims, this is not the mode of claim interpretation to be applied during examination. During examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allowed. This means that the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless applicant has provided a

clear definition in the specification. *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Duperray (USPN 6,507,244) teaches a transmitter with a sliding compression point, Parssinen et al. (2003/0124999) teaches a method and apparatus for scaling the dynamic range of a receiver for continuously optimizing performance versus power consumption, Richards et al. (USPN 6,289,048) teaches a apparatus and method for improving a dynamic range in a receiver Suganuma et al. (USPN 5,507,023) teaches a receiver with an AGC circuit capable of expanding a dynamic range, Younis et al. (USPN 6,134,430) teaches a programmable dynamic range receiver with adjustable dynamic range analog to digital converter Sternberg et al. (USPN 6,606,583) teaches a real time error suppression method and apparatus therefor and Bunch (5,896,103) teaches a method and apparatus for dynamically calibrating a radar receiver,

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aditya S Bhat whose telephone number is 703-308-0332. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Barlow can be reached on 703-308-3126. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-5841 for regular communications and 703-308-5841 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2863

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Aditya Bhat
October 19, 2005

BRYAN BUI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

